



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,814	10/12/2001	Masashi Sahara	501.40724X00	8257
20457	7590	12/01/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889				QUACH, TUAN N
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2814

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/974,814	SAHARA ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan Quach	Art Unit 2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 103 and 105-132 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**Continuation of Disposition of Claims:** Claims pending in the application are 1,3-8,10-15,17-22,24-29,31-36,38-43,45-50,52-57,59-64,66-103 and 105-132.

**Continuation of Disposition of Claims:** Claims withdrawn from consideration are 1,3-8,10-15,17-22,24-29,31-36,38-43,45-50,52-57,59-64 and 66-102.

## DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on September 7, 2004 has been entered. Claims 103, 110 are amended. Claim 104 is cancelled. New claims 113-132 are added.

Applicant's written request for interview signed by applicant's representative William Solomon is noted. A telephone call with a message regarding the issue of request for interview was made to him November 22, 2004 at 10:30 am but no call has been returned as of close of business day of November 26, 2004. If applicant still wants an interview, its representative is to call the examiner to arrange for such interview responsive to this Office action; a blanket written request for an interview is not proper response and has no legal force to stay an Office action for such interview to be consummated. This Office action is not made final and applicant's request for such interview prior to the issuance of final Office action will be granted.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 103, 105-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 325 328, Kamal, Hong, Lee, and Zeininger taken together.

Re claim 103, 105-132, '328 teaches forming semiconductor integrated circuit device comprising forming a gate insulating film on semiconductor substrate 1, forming conductive gate 6, 7, forming self-aligned lightly doped semiconductor regions 12/13, forming second insulating films 14 onside surface of conductive or gate 6, 7, forming second semiconductor region 10 and 11 of source/drain regions having higher concentration , HF cleaning, argon sputter etching of less 20 nm, thus encompassing less than 2.5 nm, forming silicides 6a-11a, including cobalt silicide. See column 6 line 1 to column 7 line 45, column 14 line 40. '328 lacks anticipation in that it does not explicitly recite the gate dimension to be of 0.18 micron or less. Such selection of gate dimension nonetheless would have been encompassed in such processing given that such processing does not preclude or exclude its application to form devices of

desired structures, including devices wherein the gate is less than 0.18 micron.

In any event, the application of the same processing into device structures having reduced dimensions does not require any inventiveness and does not impart any patentability into the conventional processing taught by '328.

Hong also teaches self-aligned silicidation process including sub-0.18 micron CMPS wherein prior to silicidation, the use of argon sputter clean is taught wherein leakage can be reduced and application to submicron device is realized. The process allows low diode leakage silicidation and application to sub-0.18 micron NMOS technology. See page 107-108, Figs. 1-17.

Kamal also teaches self-aligned silicidation including forming gate 202, lightly doped regions aligned to gate, source drain 208, aligned to spacer 210, the sputter etching prior to metal deposition and silicidation. See column 2 lines 1 to column 3 line 23, column 3 line 65 to column 10 line 19. The contemplation to sub-0.18 micron dimension is also encompassed and contemplated (column 2 line 2. Kamal further shows the extent of the etching including the selection of removal of 20 angstrom, column 5 line 65. The advantages of silicide contacts upon such sputter cleaning including self-aligned contacts having improved device characteristics. See column 2 line 48 to column 7 line 48.

Lee teaches application of semiconductor device having reduced performance, e.g., 0.13 micron CMOS process where gate length or width of below 0.13 micron is employed to improve circuit performance and increase packing density. The use of gate, LDD implant, insulating spacer, source drain implant, and cobalt salicidation is also taught. See page 136-137, table 1.

Zeininger teaches the formation of cobalt silicide contacts to device regions of deep-submicron including sputter etching between 3 and 20 mono layers to remove the native oxide, wherein an ultra shallow damage region would be achieved prior to forming cobalt silicide contacts. Appropriate cobalt silicide thickness such as 300 nm or less is also shown. See column 2 line 25 to column 3 line 38.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in practicing the above process to have applied such process into making submicron device since such application is conventional and obvious as evidenced by Hong or Lee wherein devices of reduced dimensions and improved characteristics can be obtained. Conversely, although Hong or Kamal do not the details of forming the LDD region, spacer, and source, drain, such provision in Hong or Kmal would have been conventional and obvious wherein device components such as LDD, spacer, and source drain can be obtained as taught by '328 or Lee.

The removal of 2.5 nm or less of the top of the semiconductor substrate would have been met in '328 or Hong above and furthermore would have been a matter of optimization to remove the desired native oxide as evidenced by Kamal, as delineated above, e.g., 20 angstroms. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have employed the shallow removal range of the sputter etching including within the range of 25 nm or less since such would have been encompassed in '328 and Hong and further corresponds to an optimization well within the purview of one skilled in the art including a conventional removal range amply delineated in Kamal and in Zeininger wherein

the removal of as low as a few monolayers (between 3 and 20 monolayers) can be effected to effect an ultrashallow region prior to formation of the silicide contact to improve device characteristics.

Regarding claim 105, the silicide contacts to the second regions and not to the first regions would have been apparent in '328 at the portions delineated above, and as shown in Kamal Fig. 10, wherein the exposed region contact to the second regions and not the first region which is blocked by the spacers. Regarding claim 106, the associated reduced leakage current would be obtained as the sputter etching including the ultra shallow is taught as delineated above and is readily apparent in Hong. Regarding claim 107, the use of HF cleaning is well known in the art as evidenced by '328 as delineated above wherein cleaning can be effected. Regarding claim 108, the use of Ar sputter etching is well known in the art and is amply shown above. Regarding claim 109, the use of cobalt for cobalt silicidation is well known in the art and is amply shown above. Regarding claim 110, the cobalt silicide thickness being between 200 and 400 angstrom would have been a matter of routine optimization and well known in the art and is amply shown above, including by Zeininger as delineated. Regarding claims 111 and 112, the removal of the top of the conductive film and/or of the semiconductor device would correspond to the sputter etching including of the gate and/or source drain region where the silicide contacts are desired as shown above. Regarding claims 113-116, the recessed region claimed would correspond to the corresponding regions in the prior art upon which the sputter etching is applied in the same process as in the instant application and would

have been obvious for the reasons delineated above and as discussed above wherein the sputter etching is effected in a blanket fashion and would effect the gate as well as the source/drain regions.

Claims 117-123 and 124-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 328, Kamal, Hong , Lee and Zeininger as applied to claims 103, 105-116 above, and further in view of Rho or Yan.

Regarding claims 117 and 118, including the selection of the first doped regions to be less than 50 nm and second regions to be less than 1500 angstroms, such optimization to obtain submicron device would have been encompassed in the prior art above which does not preclude or exclude such junction depths. Furthermore, Rho shows that it is important to form extremely shallow source/drain junction to reduce short channel effect in submicron devices. See page 291, 292, Fig. 4. Yan also shows the conventionality of shallow junctions, e.g., Fig. 2, pages 86 and junction depth of 300 angstroms and its application to submicron devices having high performance good subthreshold characteristics and controlled short channel effects.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have optimized the doped region thicknesses as such would have been encompassed in the references delineated above which do not preclude such range, e.g., Hong, to obtain shallow junctions, Fig. 3, 5, 9, and as shown in Rho or Yan above wherein such optimization would allow formation of shallow source drain junctions and permit reduction of short channel effects and applications in deep submicron devices.

Regarding the Ar for sputter etching in claim 119, the cobalt for cobalt silicidation in claim 120, the thickness of cobalt silicide being 20 to 40 nm, the sputter etch being 2.5 nm is less for the top of the conductive gate and simultaneous sputter etching in claims 121-123, such correspond to the similar limitations previously discussed in claims 108-113 above and would have been obvious for the reasons delineated above and as discussed above wherein the sputter etching is effected in a blanket fashion and would effect the gate as well as the source/drain regions

Regarding claims 124 and 127, this corresponds to substantially similar limitations in claim 103 and 117 or 118, with the components of the FET devices now being specifically called, e.g., a MISFET instead of a semiconductor device, gate instead of a conductive film in claim 103, first source/drain aligned with the gate instead of first semiconductor regions, sidewall of MISFET instead of insulating film on side surface of conductive film, etc., nonetheless correspond to substantially same subject matter render obvious by the teachings delineated above with regard to claim 103. The limitation of first source drain to be 50 nm in claim 124 step c) and second source drain to be less than 50 nm or less as in claim 127 step c) correspond to the limitations in claim 117 and 118 and accordingly, such would have been further obvious for the same reasons delineated above wherein such shallow junctions are not precluded or excluded by the applied prior art and wherein such shallow junctions are explicitly recited to be advantageous to obtain reduced short channel effects in deep submicron applications as delineated in Rho or Yan.

Regarding claims 125 and 126 regarding the silicides not contacting the first regions and the leakage current being prevented, such would have been met for the reasons delineated above, e.g., with regard to claims 105, 106.

Regarding claims 128-132 concerning Ar for sputter etching, cobalt for silicides, cobalt thickness of 20 to 40 nm, sputter etch also of the gate and simultaneous, such correspond to the limitations in claims 108-113 above and as discussed above wherein the sputter etching is effected in a blanket fashion and would effect the gate as well as the source/drain regions

Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejections delineated above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Quach whose telephone number (571) 272-1717. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F from 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.



Tuan Quach  
Primary Examiner